Initially, although section 9 of the Office Action indicates that the Office Action is "Final", Applicant understands that the indication is a typographical error, and that the outstanding Office Action is not "Final", as was confirmed in a telephone conversation held between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on February 4, 2000.

In the Office Action, Claims 66-68, 70, 71, 73-75, 77, 78, and 80-107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,398,311 (Seto) in view of U.S. Patent 4,897,638 (Kokunishi et al.), U.S. Patent 5,562,350 (Sakurai), and the article entitled "Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice", Second Edition, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1990, pp. 488-490, by *Foley et al.*

The cancellation of Claims 66-68, 70, 71, 73-75, 77, 78, and 80-107 renders this rejection moot.

With regard to added Claims 108-123, Applicant offers the following comments.

Independent Claim 108 is directed to an outline forming apparatus which comprises a storage medium for storing coordinate data indicating a position of an outline point of a pattern, first vector data indicating a change of the coordinate data when a weight value defining a width of a pattern is between a first weight value and a second weight value, and second vector data indicating a change of the

8

coordinate data when the weight value is between the second

weight value and a third weight value. An inputter of the

apparatus is arranged for inputting a weight value, a

selector of the apparatus is arranged for selecting either

the first vector data or the second vector data, based on the

weight value input by the inputter, and an outline point

determiner is arranged for determining an outline point by

changing the coordinate data in accordance with either the

first vector data or the second vector data selected by the

selector.

These features enable the apparatus to handle a

case in which a function of the vector data of an outline

point (coordinate data) changes by a predetermined weight

value.

Seto relates to generating outline points based on

reference coordinates (Rx, Ry) and relative distance data

(Fx, Fy) stored in a memory (Fig. 2b). According to *Seto*,

positions of outline points change in accordance with a

predetermined "rate". However, *Seto* is not seen to teach or

suggest changing a manner of moving outline points.

Kokunishi refers to a defining parameters 1, 2, and

3 for edge-side shape classes (Fig. 4). Since an edge-side

shape is determined according with a font type, the

parameters for an edge-side shape change based upon the font

type, and thus differ from vector data of Claim 108 which changes based on a weight value.

Sakurai relates to using different font data in accordance with a size of a pattern, but is not seen to teach or suggest moving an outline point in accordance with a designated weight value.

Accordingly, in Applicant's view, nothing in either Seto, Kokunishi, or Sakurai, would teach or suggest an outline forming apparatus having features as are defined in Claim 108, including a selector for selecting either first or second vector data, based on an inputted weight value, and an outline point determiner for determining an outline point by changing coordinate data indicating a position of an outline point of a pattern, in accordance with the selected first or second vector data, wherein the first vector data indicates a change of the coordinate data when a weight value defining a width of a pattern is between a first weight value and a second weight value, and the second vector data indicates a change of the coordinate data when the weight value is between the second weight value and a third weight value.

Neither is the Foley et al. article seen to teach or suggest anything which would cure the deficiencies of Seto, Kokunishi, and Sakurai as references against Claim 108.

10

Thus, Claim 108 is deemed to be clearly patentable over *Seto*, *Kokunishi*, *Sakurai*, and *Foley et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination.

Claims 115, 122, and 123 are method, computer readable medium, and program product claims, respectively, which correspond to apparatus Claim 108, and also are believed to be patentable over *Seto*, *Kokunishi*, *Sakurai*, and *Foley et al.*, for at least the same reasons as those argued above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200